

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Claims 26-28 have been added. Support for the amended and new claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that claims 1-7 and 17-25 are allowed. Applicants further acknowledge Examiner's indication that claim 9-15 define patentable subject matter. The Examiner states that claims 9-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,309,748 to Forro et al. ("Forro").

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,301,133 to Cuadra et al. ("Cuadra") or U.S. patent 5,659,208 to Kimble et al. ("Kimble").

THE CLAIMS

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and following remarks.

Claim 8

Applicants submit that Forro does not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants request Examiner to provide support for his rejection of claim 8. For example, claim 8 recites, in part, "... a first overvoltage detecting circuit coupled to an input of said filter; a second overvoltage detecting circuit coupled to an output of said filter; and a logic gate coupled to said first overvoltage detecting circuit and said second overvoltage detecting circuit, said logic gate having a gate output for controlling said voltage supplying source." Presumably, Examiner incorrectly analogizes alarm circuit J in Forro to a second overvoltage detecting circuit as claimed. However, with respect to alarm circuit J, Forro recites "[i]f some of the voltages fail, the diode, connected to its output, goes out, the relay releases, its contacts get disrupted and the central alarm circuit KA of electrical operation

signals." (Forro: col. 7, lines 53-56). Accordingly, it is clear that the alarm circuit J is not a second overvoltage detecting circuit as claimed.

Therefore, claim 8 should be allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 16

Applicants submit that neither Cuadra nor Kimble teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants request Examiner to provide support for his rejection of claim 16. For example, claim 16 recites, in part, "... said N+1 D.C. power supplies coupled together in parallel, wherein N is an integer, said overvoltage system comprising: a first power supply of said N+1 D.C. power supplies, comprising: a plurality of overvoltage detecting circuits in said first power supply, wherein one overvoltage detecting circuit of said plurality of overvoltage detecting circuits compares said load voltage with a reference voltage; and a logic gate receiving outputs of said plurality of overvoltage detecting circuits for turning off said first power supply when an overvoltage occurs in said first power supply; and"

With respect to Cuadra, Cuadra may disclose a single detector 120 for detecting when the bus voltage exceeds an overvoltage value, but not a plurality of overvoltage detecting circuits in the manner claimed. Detector circuit 100 of Cuadra is an undervoltage detector. (Cuadra: col. 8, lines 12-15). Detector 110 of Cuadra is a short circuit detector. (Cuadra: col. 8, lines 47-49). Voltage monitor circuit (130) of Cuadra "monitors voltage at the source of the MOSFET devices as shown in FIG. 3 and includes a circuit for supplying auxiliary power comprising an auxiliary power source 504," (Cuadra: col. 11, lines 13-18). Output of the voltage monitor circuit 130 does not turn off the power supply when an overvoltage occurs.

With respect to Kimble, Examiner presumably analogizes each 3.5V DC-to-DC converter 31, 32, and 33 of Kimble to the N+1 D.C. power supplies coupled together in parallel as claimed. However, as clearly shown in Fig. 3 of Kimble, each converter 31, 32, and 33 is connected to a single detector 40, 41, and 42, respectively. Kimble clearly fails to teach or suggest a plurality of overvoltage detecting circuits in said first power supply in the manner claimed, as well as the other features recited in claim 16.

Therefore, claim 16 should be allowable for at least these reasons.

New Claims

None of the cited references teach or suggest the features as recited in claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 should be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 27 recites, in part, "... a first overvoltage detecting circuit coupled to an input of said filter; a second overvoltage detecting circuit coupled to an output of said filter; and a logic gate coupled to said first overvoltage detecting circuit and said second overvoltage detecting circuit, said logic gate having a gate output for controlling said voltage supplying source." None of the cited references teach or suggest these features as recited in claim 27. Therefore, claims 27 should be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 28, which depends from claim 1, should be allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Tyrome Y. Brown
Reg. No. 46,580

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
Attachments
TYB:asb
60107156 v1